

KARL S. HALL
Reno City Attorney
WILLIAM E. COOPER
Deputy City Attorney
Nevada State Bar No. 2213
Post Office Box 1900
Reno, Nevada 89505
(775) 334-2050
*Attorneys for City of Reno
and Jason Soto*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * ◇ * *

REBECCA GASCA, an individual,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

CASE NO.: 3:22-cv-00238-MMD-CSD

**ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED
COMPLAINT**

CITY OF RENO, Nevada, a Municipal
Corporation; WASHOE COUNTY
SHERIFF'S OFFICE, a Municipal
Corporation; DOUNGLAS COUNTY
SHERIFF'S OFFICE, a Municipal
Corporation; JASON SOTO, in his
individual capacity; DARIN BALAAM, in
his individual capacity; DANIEL
COVERLEY, in his individual capacity;
DOES I-X,

Defendants. /

Defendants City of Reno ("City") and Jason Soto ("Soto"), collectively referred to as the "Reno Defendants", by and through their attorneys, Reno City Attorney Karl S. Hall and Deputy City Attorney William E. Cooper, hereby respond to the Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint and the allegations contained therein, by admitting, denying and averring as follows:

1. Reno Defendants admit the allegations contained in Paragraphs 10, 65, and 68 of the Complaint.

2. Reno Defendants deny each and every allegation contained in Paragraphs 12, 14,

1 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 50, 53, 66, 67, 70, 71, 72, 76, 77, 80, 81, 84,
 2 85, 86, 87, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 105, 106, 107, 108, 110, 115, 116, 119, 120, 121, 122,
 3 126, 130, 133, 134, 135, 136, 139, 140, 141, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 152, 153, 154, 155,
 4 158, 159, 160, 161, 164, 165, 169, 170, 171, 174, 175, 176, 178, 179, 180, 184, 185, 186, 191,
 5 192, 193, 194 and 195 of the Complaint.

6 3. Reno Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief
 7 as to the truth of the allegations contained in Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35,
 8 36, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 69, 78,
 9 79, 82, 83, 96, 103, 104, 112, 113, 114, 117, 118, 127, 128, 129, 131, 132, 137, 138, 150, 151,
 10 162, 163, 168, 172, 173, 181, 182, 183, 189 and 190 of the Complaint and therefore deny the same.

11 4. With regard to the allegations contained in paragraph 11 of the Complaint, Reno
 12 Defendants admit City of Reno has authority to promulgate municipal policy through municipal
 13 officials who have final policymaking authority. Reno Defendants are without knowledge or
 14 information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 11
 15 of the Complaint and therefore deny the same.

16 5. With regard to the allegations contained in Paragraph 13 of the Complaint, Reno
 17 Defendants admit the Reno Police Department is a Department of the City of Reno with
 18 jurisdiction to enforce state and local laws. Reno Defendants are without knowledge or information
 19 sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 13 of the
 20 Complaint and therefore deny the same.

21 6. With regard to the allegations contained in Paragraph 29 of the Complaint, Reno
 22 Defendants admit Washoe County Sheriff's Office ('WCSO') deployed officers and exercised a
 23 response to the May 30 BLM protest. Reno Defendants are without knowledge or information
 24 sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 29 of the
 25 Complaint and therefore deny the same.

26 7. With regard to the allegations contained in Paragraph 37 of the Complaint, Reno
 27 Defendants admit Defendant Darin Balaam is the elected Sheriff of WCSO. Reno Defendants are
 28 without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining

1 allegations in Paragraph 37 of the Complaint and therefore deny the same.

2 8. With regard to the allegations contained in Paragraph 41 of the Complaint, Reno
3 Defendants admit Douglas County Sheriff's Office ("DCSO") deployed officers and exercised a
4 response to the May 30 BLM protest. Reno Defendants are without knowledge or information
5 sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 41 of the
6 Complaint and therefore deny the same.

7 9. With regard to the allegations contained in Paragraph 42 of the Complaint, Reno
8 Defendants admit Daniel Coverley is the elected Sheriff of DCSO. Reno Defendants are without
9 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in
10 Paragraph 42 of the Complaint and therefore deny the same.

11 10. With regard to the allegations contained in Paragraphs 74, 89, 157, and 167 of the
12 Complaint, Reno Defendants admit that both the United States Constitution and the Constitution
13 of the State of Nevada, prohibit the violation the Constitutional Rights, but Reno Defendants deny
14 violating Plaintiff's constitutional rights and deny all allegations of wrongdoing, liability and
15 responsibility for damages.

16 11. With regard to all allegations containing citations to statutory or case law, assertions
17 regarding the interpretation, meaning or application of such law, or general assertions about any
18 law or body of law, such allegations are not factual allegations to which a response is required.
19 Except where otherwise clearly indicated, Reno Defendants do not adopt, admit or deny Plaintiff's
20 allegations concerning any law or its interpretations. This paragraph is the response to the
21 allegations and legal argument contained in Paragraphs 5, 75, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 111, 124, 125,
22 143, and 188 of the Complaint.

23 5. Reno Defendants re-assert their responses to the respective allegations re-alleged
24 by Plaintiff in Paragraphs 73, 88, 109, 123, 142, 156, 166, 177 and 187 of the Complaint.

25 **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

26 1. Plaintiff fails to allege facts sufficient to state a claim upon which relief can be
27 granted.

28 2. With respect to Plaintiff's State Law claims, no action may be brought against the

1 Reno Defendants which is based upon the exercise or performance or the failure to exercise or
2 perform a discretionary function. NRS 41.032

3 3. No action may be brought against, or damages recovered from, a Chief of a Police
4 Department which is based solely upon an act or omission of an officer of the Department. NRS
5 41.0335.

6 4. An award of damages in an action sounding in tort brought against a present or
7 former officer or employee of the State or any political subdivision, arising out of an act or
8 omission within the scope of the person's public duties or employment may not exceed the sum of
9 \$150,000, exclusive of interest computed from the date of judgment, to or for the benefit of any
10 claimant. An award may not include any amount as exemplary or punitive damages. NRS 41.035.

11 5. Plaintiff failed to mitigate her damages and assumed the risk of injury by voluntarily
12 entering into the confrontation between law enforcement officers and violent protesters.

13 6. No act or omission of the Reno Defendants was a substantial factor in bringing
14 about the damages alleged by Plaintiff, nor was any act or omission by Reno Defendants a
15 contributing cause thereof. Any act or omission of Reno Defendants was superseded or preceded
16 by the acts or omissions of third parties, which were the independent, intervening, legal and
17 proximate cause of the damages allegedly suffered by Plaintiff.

18 7. Plaintiff's claims are barred by the doctrines of accord and satisfaction, waiver,
19 estoppel, laches and unclean hands.

20 8. Plaintiff's claims are barred by her failure to comply with statutory prerequisites,
21 including the statute of limitations.

22 9. Reno Defendant Soto is shielded from liability for monetary damages pursuant to
23 the Doctrine of Qualified Immunity.

24 10. Plaintiff's alleged damages were directly, proximately and legally caused by her
25 own intentional and /or negligent actions.

26 11. The injuries and damages alleged in the Amended Complaint were caused in whole
27 or in part by the comparative negligence/negligence per se, of Plaintiff. Any liability of Reno
28 Defendants is accordingly reduced in whole or in part.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Pursuant to FRCP 5(b), I certify that I am an employee of the RENO CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, and that on this date, I am serving the foregoing document(s) on the party(s) set forth below by:

_____ Placing an original or true copy thereof in a sealed envelope placed for collection and mailing in the United States Mail, at Reno, Nevada, postage prepaid, following ordinary business practices or;

_____ Personal delivery.

 X CMECF electronic service.

_____ Facsimile (FAX).

_____ Federal Express or other overnight delivery.

_____ Reno/Carson Messenger Service.

addressed as follows:

Margaret A. McLetchie, Esq.
Leo S. Wolpert, Esq.
MCLETCHIE LAW
602 South Tenth Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

DATED this 27th day of July, 2022.

 /s/ Terri Strickland

Terri Strickland
Legal Assistant